

Thank you. My name is Tom Putnam. _____ I am a private citizen who uses Puget Sound for fishing, swimming, boating, clamming, kayaking, sailing, camping, and a number of other uses. And I am also board member of the Puget Sound Alliance and I'd like to speak on behalf of our hundreds of members who use the Sound in many of the same ways. Finally, I'm the environmental representative on the Puget Sound Council which advises the Puget Sound Action Team which is the ten or so agencies that make management decisions regarding water quality in Puget Sound. We live in a place of great beauty and environmental diversity and natural abundance. Almost since arriving here, however, we have used the natural environment as a dumping ground for industrial processes. And immense damage to our natural resources is the result. We all know PCB levels in Puget Sound Orcas. I think we were all stunned to hear recently that the transient Orca that was sampled, the one that died up near Port Angeles, has the highest levels of PCB ever recorded in a marine mammal in this area and perhaps in the world. Overall our Puget Sound Orcas are extremely contaminated with toxic chemicals. We've seen plummeting populations of herring, of ground fish, certain species of salmon. In Elliot Bay, studies have shown serious liver lesions and increasing liver lesions and liver cancers in English Sole. And these are thought to be a result of polyaromatic hydrocarbons which are largely a bi-product of burning petroleum elements and come in from stormwater and from air deposition from smog, but largely through washing off the surfaces in our land and in our environment. I mentioned the Puget Sound Management Plan which is written to give guidance to agencies in the Puget Sound which have practices that affect water quality. Both the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Ecology have adopted this as a guiding document as planned. The goal of the stormwater program of the plan is to achieve standards of both water and sediment quality by managing stormwater runoff and reducing combined sewer overflows. We do commend aspects of the Department of Ecology's revised permit. It now requires permittees to meet water quality standards and also includes certain monitoring requirements that can only help us to begin to characterize and reduce stormwater pollution. I strongly support the new monitoring and reporting requirements which will help us characterize the pollutants found in stormwater and pave the way for the next permit to actually limit the discharge of these pollutants into Puget Sound. Monitoring also assists municipal jurisdictions in monitoring and tracking pollutants to their sources and helping to eliminate those. As a consumer I'm willing to support the additional costs of monitoring and reporting for stormwater discharge that might be passed on to me by industrial permittees covered under the permit. And I also very much would like emphasize that I support increased funding to the Department of Ecology to provide the technical assistance needed to help stormwater permittees learn how to monitor and report their stormwater discharges in the most efficient and economical manner. I also support legal arguments of the Puget Sound Keeper Alliance which concluded the permit still does not go far enough to protect water quality or comply with the Clean Water Act. And I support their efforts to take these compliance loop-holes out of the permit. Specifically, to cite one specific example, the compliance schedules are pretty much open-ended. I understand that they, compliance schedules will run to the end of the permit, but we feel this should be specific deadlines in compliance schedules to achieve water quality standards. Also for AKART application, the same thing goes. We need deadlines. The goal of the Clean Water Act to achieve progress in these areas and we can't have that if there's open-ended permits to pollute. Finally, I also agreed that the burden of proof for compliance with the requirements of the permit for mixing zones or no exposure should be on the permittees and not the Department of Ecology or citizens monitoring permit compliance. I believe that a permittee should not receive no exposure exception unless they can prove that rainwater falling on their property is not exposed to potential contaminants and they've used all known available

and reasonable methods of treatment to avoid the use of a mixing zone or that Ecology makes the determination that this so. I'd also like to mention that we called, I think, 150, 160 of our members asking them if they could testify at this hearing or make comments. Everyone of them said they couldn't come because it was during the day and they work during the day. I'd like to request that at least one of the hearings or some of the hearings be held in the evening so that other citizens can also attend and testify. The eminent Puget Sound oceanographer, Curtis Ebsmar, has described non-point pollution in Puget Sound as the results of the kind of marine smog. The insidious encroachment of many small amounts of chemicals into our marine environment was gradual, but eventually serious effects. We believe that all of our stormwater permits, and this will include municipal and construction down the road, must meet minimal standards of complying with water quality standards and monitoring to assist collection by monitoring stormwater discharges so that we can characterize and systematically remove sources of pollution from our waters. Again, this is the goal of the Clean Water Act and we were suppose to have fishable, swimmable waters meeting water quality standards by the year 1985. We're late. Finally, the Department of Ecology must be given the resources to do an effective job. Citizens of Washington have repeatably stressed their desire for strong environmental protection, yet the budget of the Department of Ecology is repeatably slashed, staff is cut. We must give Ecology the resource to do its job. And it's for all of our benefit. Thank you very much.